1. Dear Bishop, thank you for your letter of 25.11.2000 in response to my argument concluding to the invalidity of the New Order of Mass, as mediated to us in the vernacular.

2. You speak of 'change' (your fourth and fifth par.) and speak of it approvingly (your fifth par.). Of course you do not mean *any* change, you mean change for the better or, if it should turn out, in the event, to be not for the better, then at least change which does not destroy that which is being made subject to change. The argument you are responding to is concerned with a change demonstrably destructive of the reality subject to the change visited upon it.

2a. Immediately after writimg: '... I am not convinced by your argument,' (your third par.) you write : 'Change is often upsetting, especially etc..' The implication here is that my argument is not an argument but a convulsive thrashing around of a stick-in-the-mud, unwilling to accommodate himself to progress. The implication is wide of the mark. I said the *Novus Ordo Missae* for thirteen years with no problems except the mild discontent of one forced to read banalities time and time again. It was only when I started to study that I realized that I had been inveigled into co-operating in what had all the appearance of an invalid procedure. It took a few years more for the appearance to change into a settled conviction. All told it took another thirteen years after the original discovery for me to take fright and start thinking of how I should explain to God at the judgement, my keeping my findings to myself. So I started writing. That is the writing you say has not convinced you.

3. The way you write of change you are clearly equating it with growth, for 'the Church has to grow like the mustard seed or it will never offer shelter to the nations.' Fine sentiments, but they are irrelevant to the concrete reality to which, presumably, they are applied. They clearly do not square with, for example, the public apology to the faithful by Pope John Paul II in his Apostolic Letter *Dominicae Cenae* (1980). That unprecedented initiative reads:

> 'I would like to ask forgiveness in my own name and in the name of all of you, venerable and dear brothers in the episcopate, for everything which, for whatever reason, through whatever human weakness, impatience or negligence, and also through the at times partial, one-sided and erroneous applications of the directives of the Second Vatican Council, may have caused scandal and disturbance concerning the interpretation of the doctrine and the veneration due to this great Sacrament.'

4. Nor do they square with the *Ratzinger Report*, which marked another official recognition of the distortions to which the Council was subject. The Cardinal's frank admission of outrages in the post-conciliar Church paved the way for a similar admission on the part of the Second Extraordinary Synod at the end of 1985.

5. Since the argument you are replying to deals with the change effected in the form of the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist, specifically, the change, in the form, of the words 'for many' to 'for all,' you are implying that *that* change is a means of growth or, at least, not invalidating. Further, that *that* change will assist the Church to 'offer shelter to the nations.'

By Fr T.D. MEULI (NZ)

6. You do not demonstrate that *that* change is growth, you are content merely to imply that it is growth. In that connection you may consider relevant Monsignor Klaus Gamber's observation concerning that change. It is to be found in his *Reform of the Roman Liturgy; Its Problems and Background*. He writes at page 55:

> 'Truly problematic, in fact truly scandalous, is the translation of the phrase *pro multis* as 'for all,' a translation inspired by modern theological thinking but not to be found in any historical liturgical text.'

7. At page 185 he has a sub-heading reading: 'Why the Translation of "For You and for All" is Wrong.' In the argumentation under that heading, he has, at page 187: 'We can conclude that on a philological basis, no valid argument can be made to justify the translation "for all."'

8. Which raises a question: 'Why would Paul VI's *pro multis* be incorrectly translated as 'for all' in the first place? Why was it not simply translated correctly? What possible harm could derive from a correct translation? If, as stated above it is a 'translation' inspired by modern theological thinking, if it is without philological support, the answer is to hand. It was so translated to conform to and further the current fashionable aberration, viz. universal salvation.

9. Though 'growth' and 'shelter' are not germane to the argument which is strictly about the invalidity of the new sacramental form, since you bring the matter of 'growth' and 'shelter' up, you might find instructive what Monsignor Gamber has elsewhere in his trenchant treatment of the reform.

At page 9, he writes:

> 'The liturgical reform welcomed with so much idealism and hope by many priests and lay people alike has turned out to be a liturgical destruction of startling proportions - a debacle worsening with each passing year. Instead of the hoped-for renewal of the Church and of Catholic life, we are now witnessing a dismantling of the traditional values and piety on which our faith rests. Instead of a fruitful renewal of the liturgy, what we see is a destruction of the forms of the Mass which had developed organically during the course of many centuries.'

10. Following on from that paragraph he draws to the attention of the reader a work of destruction which may never even have crossed the minds of either the proponents or the opponents of the reform. He describes this damage in the following terms:

> 'Added to this state of affairs is the shocking assimilation of Protestant ideas brought into the Church under the guise of the misunderstood term *ecumenism* with a resulting **growing estrangement from the ancient Churches of the East, that is, a turning away from the common tradition that has been shared by the East and the West up to this point in our history.** (my emphasis)

'Among those who played key roles in bringing about liturgical reform, more and more have come to realize that they are simply unable to control the very spirit they unleashed.'

11. As to the 'growing estrangement from the ancient Churches of the East,' the 'Short Critical Study of the New Order of Mass' known commonly as 'The Ottaviani Intervention,' has something relevant. Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, head under three Popes, of the Holy Office, the Vatican Tribunal responsible for uprooting heresy and protecting the purity of the Catholic Faith, states:

'The Apostolic Constitution explicitly mentions the riches of piety and doctrine the *Novus Ordo* supposedly borrows from the Eastern Churches. But the result is so removed from, and indeed opposed to the spirit of the Eastern liturgies that it can only leave the faithful of those rites revolted and horrified.

'What do these ecumenical borrowings amount to? Basically, to introducing multiple texts for the Eucharistic Prayer (the *anaphora*) - none of which approaches their Eastern counterparts' complexity or beauty - and to permitting Communion Under Both Species and the use of deacons.

'Against this, the New Order of Mass appears to have been deliberately shorn of every element where the Roman Liturgy came closest to the Eastern rites. At the same time, by abandoning its unmistakable and immemorial Roman character, the *Novus Ordo* cast off what was spiritually precious of its own. In place of this are elements which bring the new rite closer to certain Protestant liturgies, not even those closest to Catholicism. At the same time, these new elements degrade the Roman liturgy and further alienate it from the East, as did the reforms which preceded the *Novus Ordo.*

'In compensation, the new liturgy will delight all those groups hovering on the verge of apostasy who, during a spiritual crisis without precedent, now wreak havoc in the Church by poisoning her organism and by undermining her unity in doctrine, worship, morals and discipline.' (*Tan* edition, page 53)

Returning to Monsignor Gamber's treatment of the reform, there is at page 101, the following:

'The pastoral benefits that so many idealists had hoped the new liturgy would bring did not materialize. Our churches emptied in spite of the new liturgy (or because of it?) and the faithful continue to fall away from the Church in droves. ...

'Today, many among us wonder: Is this the spring people had hoped would emerge from the Second Vatican Council? Instead of a genuine renewal in our Church, we have seen only novelties. Instead of our religious life entering a period of new invigoration, as has happened in the past, what we see now is a form of Christianity that has turned towards the world.

'We are now involved in a liturgy in which God is no longer the centre of our attention. Today, the eyes of our faithful are no longer focused on God's Son having become Man

> hanging before us on the cross, ... but on the human community assembled for a commemorative meal. The assembly of people is sitting there, face to face with the 'presider,' expecting from him, in accordance with the 'modern' spirit of the Church, not so much a transfer of God's grace, but primarily some good ideas and advice on how to deal with daily life and its challenges. ...
>
> 'The real destruction of the traditional Mass, of the traditional Roman rite with a history of more than one thousand years, is the wholesale destruction of the faith on which it was based, a faith that had been the source of our piety and of our courage to bear witness to Christ and his Church, the inspiration of countless Catholics over many centuries.'

12. That 'wholesale destruction of the faith' just now mentioned might be what Paul VI was referring to when, addressing the Lombard College in Rome, he spoke of the 'Auto-destruction of the Church' (7.12.1968). He lamented:

> 'The Church is in a disturbed period of self-criticism, or what would better be called self-demolition. It is an acute and complicated upheaveal which nobody would have expected after the council. It is almost as if the Church were attacking herself.'

He continued:

> 'In the Church too this state of uncertainty reigns. It was believed that after the council a sunny day in the Church's history would dawn, but instead there came a day of clouds, storms and darkness.'

13. Pope Paul could reasonably be thought to have in mind the 'wholesale destruction of the faith' when on the 29th June 1972 he said that he sensed 'that from somewhere or other the smoke of Satan has entered the temple of God.' Similarly when he drew on the Apocalypse to identify the 'Tail of the Devil destroying the Catholic World' (13.10.1977).

14. In his homily *In Coena Domini*, delivered 3.4.1969 he said: 'A practically schismatic ferment divides, subdivides, splits the Church.' Those terms 'divides,' 'subdivides,' 'splits,' bespeak fragmentation. 'Fragmentation' means many fragments, each fragment with its own idea of what may be the faith. That amounts to a 'wholesale destruction of the faith.'

15. 'It is rather strong to claim that the new Mass is **contrary** (my emphasis) to the Council of Trent, but, displeasing as it is, it is true.' Thus spoke Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani.

In *The Ottaviani Intervention* signed by himself and by Antonio Cardinal Bacci and presented to Pope Paul VI, 5th June 1969, there is the blunt assertion that:

> 'It is obvious that the New Order of Mass has no intention of presenting the Faith taught by the Council of Trent. But it is to this Faith that the Catholic conscience is bound forever.' (*Tan* edition page 53)

16. Otherwise expressed, the quotation immediately preceding is saying that the framers of the rite, i.e. the framers of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, intended to present a faith other than, and contrary to, that to be found in Trent. That entails a defect of intention on the part of the framers of the rite. That is sufficient in itself and *a priori* to support a judgement that the *Novus Ordo Missae* is invalid. It is the self-same ground (i.e. defect of intention on the part of the framers of the rite) that Leo XIII relied on to declare Anglican orders invalid.

17. One reads in *The Ottaviani Intervention* that the new liturgy, 'due to the countless liberties it implicitly authorizes, cannot but be a sign of division,' that it is 'a liturgy which teems with insinuations or manifest errors against the integrity of the Catholic Faith,' that its introduction 'is an incalculable error.' (*Ibid.* page 55)

18. As to 'manifest errors' with which that liturgy 'teems' one error may serve as an example for all the rest. The preface to the fourth Eucharistic Prayer affirms 'You alone are God.' Those words are addressed to God the Father. They are a plain avowal of Arianism.

19. Allow me one more example. This example shows the incompetence of the ideologues who wrecked the liturgy. I speak of the priest facing the people across the altar. It was stated that this was a return to the ancient practice of yore. Scholars have proved that it was not a return at all, it was and is an inane novelty. Inane, because the very nature of sacrifice requires that the priest and people face the Divinity to whom the sacrifice is being made. Novelty, because it was unknown before Martin Luther introduced it. It was then picked up and imposed by that sinister gang headed by Mons. Fred McManus, who calls the shots, **all** of the shots, in ICEL. Monsignor Gamber has over forty pages on this matter of the priest facing the people.

20. An altar facing the congregation presents serious difficulties. If, as often happens, it stands in front of the tabernacle, then the celebrant most unbecomingly turns his back on the Blessed Sacrament to face the people. This arrangement recalls the 'abomination' deplored in Ezechiel 8:16 where the priests sacrifice with their backs turned to the *Sancta Sanctorum*, the Holy of Holies.

21. The unsuitability of this arrangement is all the more obvious when one considers that under the Old Law the Holy of Holies was merely a prefiguration of what was to come, whereas in a Catholic church we are dealing with the *Sanctissimum*, i.e. with the Holy One Himself.

22. Priest and people once were, all of them, turned to a God who is symbolically before and above them. That position reflects a hierarchical arrangement and a theocentric orientation. The new arrangement is anthropocentric. 'Man is Baal!' They **were** facing God. **Now** they face each other! Pitiful!

23. How much money has been spent on that gross error? World wide, I mean. A billion? Half a billion? And what is particularly ghastly to contemplate is that as long as it remains thus it is continuing to do damage.

24. It is not a matter of 'No problem. We'll get used to it.' That is precisely the problem, viz. we shall get used to it. That is to say: get used to the anthropocentric principle replacing the theocentric principle of the former arrangement. The latest emission from Rome on this matter as good as institutionalizes the error as it is commonly held to have said that an altar facing the people is preferable. (In fact it didn't say that, but I don't want to argue that matter here.)

25. A principle does not have to be explicitly grasped in the mind of the knower to be operative. Operative principles have a life of their own. Even if the person under its sway does not desire to follow the principle to its logical conclusion, the principle itself will drag the adherer to that conclusion. It is only a matter of time.

26. As for children coming on, they have never experienced the appropriate principle, the theocentric principle, all they have ever known is the aberration, the anthropocentric principle and they will inevitably function in a manner proportioned to the erroneous formation they have received.

27. Relevant also are the observations by Cardinal Ratzinger, in his turn, head of the Holy Office. Cardinal Ratzinger states in his book *From My Life* that the new Mass has done 'extremely serious damage to the Church' and that the suppression of the old Mass marked a 'break in the history of the liturgy' with 'tragic' consequences. He holds that the single greatest mistake liturgically was turning the priest toward the people, which is without any warrant whatsoever, indeed if one cares actually to read the rubrics of the *Novus Ordo* it will be seen that they assume that the priest and people will be facing in the same direction, viz. *ad orientem*.

28. He says the new Mass 'is presented as a new structure, in opposition to the one which has been formed through history.' 'I am convinced' he writes, 'the ecclesial crisis in which we find ourselves today depends in great part on the collapse of the liturgy.'

29. Collapse? How can collapse be equated with growth? It may be that you hold Cardinal Ratzinger to be mistaken, so I invite you to look at 'growth' from a different perspective, from a statistical perspective.

30. There is an instructive article in the Homiletic and Pastoral Review, October 2000. It shows that Mass attendance of Catholics in the United States, England and Wales fell precipitously in the decade following the liturgical changes and has continued to decline ever since.

31. The usual reaction to information of that kind is to theorize that the drop is due to other factors in a society coming apart at the seams and that the drop would have been worse had the changes not occurred. What is needed to test that theory is a control group. A control group is at hand. It is provided by the Protestants.

32. If the drop in Mass attendance of Catholics in the U.S., England and Wales is due to societal factors not connected with the liturgy, the Protestants, since they live in the same society, should manifest a very similar drop. They don't. What the Protestants show is a relative stability with, lately, an increase.

33. I do not wish to linger any longer on the matter of change and such effusions as 'giving shelter to the nations.' It is because the shelter has been ruthlessly stripped from the nations by the imposition of an invalid procedure that my dissertation was penned in the first place. Content with paraphrasing Cardinal Ottaviani, I affirm that the damage wrought by the changes is incalculable and turn now to extracting from your letter what is relevant to the thesis I have advanced, viz. that the *Novus Ordo Missae* is invalid through a defect in form.

34. To extract from your letter what is relevant to the thesis advanced is far from easy because nowhere in your letter do you address the argument. You leave the argument untouched. Instead of saying that the argument is fallacious for this or these reasons, you content yourself with generalities of the bald *ipse dixit* form and with theological novelties coming I know not whence.

35. To be found in your seventh paragraph are the words: 'To cling to the norm of the Church as propounded ... in terms of mediaeval concepts is archaic.'

That is an example of *suggestio falsi.* The way the sentence containing the word 'archaic' is constructed and the context in which it is found suggest (hence: *suggestio*) that 'archaic' is bad. There is no proof that it is bad, it is not even stated that it is bad, it is merely suggested by implication that it is bad.

36. Once the suggestion is set up that 'archaic' is bad, the reader is by that means manoeuvred into concluding that therefore the argument is false, (hence: *falsi*, hence: *suggestio falsi*). Now the argument I have advanced may or may not be false but whether it is archaic or not is irrelevant. If it is false it is false not because it is archaic (allowing for the sake of argument, but not conceding, that it is archaic) but because there is a fallacy in the reasoning.

37. Reasoning may be fallacious either materially or formally. It would be fallacious formally if the conclusion did not derive from the premises as given. There is no evidence that that has happened. If it has happened it should be easy to identify. Assuming for the nonce that that has not happened, assuming, that is, that the reasoning from the premises conforms to the rules of reasoning, there remains the possibility that the argument concludes incorrectly because the material from which the argument is constructed happens to be wrong.

38. The argument condensed in a few propositions is:

> The form of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist must signify the sacramental grace it effects and effect the sacramental grace it signifies (Leo XIII).
>
> The sacramental grace (*res sacramenti*) of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist is the union of the Mystical Body (S.Th., Florence, Trent *et al.*).
>
> Therefore the form of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist must signify the union of the Mystical Body.
>
> The words 'for many' of the old form signify the union of the Mystical Body.

The words 'for all' of the new form do not signify the union of the Mystical Body.

39. Leo XIII can hardly be relegated to the category of 'archaic.' The use by Paul VI in his *Mysterium Fidei* and in his 'Credo of the People of God' of the mediaeval term 'transubstantiation' and the use today of such terms as 'matter' and 'form' and 'substance', a term you use yourself in your letter, in the exposition of Sacramental Theology - all terms harking back to the middle ages and before - does not make *Mysterium Fidei* or Pope Paul's 'Credo of the People of God' wrong, nor does it invalidate the principles of Sacramental Theology.

40. Further, the argument is exclusively about one thing, viz. the change from *for many* to *for all.* It is affirmed that *for many* signifies the *Res Sacramenti* and that *for all* does not. These affirmations are supported by argumentation, which argumentation has, so far, not been touched, even glancingly, by anybody attempting a rebuttal.

41. *For many* and *for all* cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered *archaic.* But, even if they could be considered *archaic*, the plain fact remains that *for many* means, without putting too fine a point on it: 'for many,' while *for all* means: 'for many plus the rest.'

42. They do not mean the same thing. The Catechism of the Council of Trent notes this difference of meaning and explains why *for many* is used and why *for all* is not used. Not only does the Catechism explain why *for all* is not used, it explains why *for all* may not be used. Here following is the explanation from page 207 of the first translation of the Trent Catechism into the English language, published in London in 1687, under the Catholic King James II:

> 'For if we look at the *vertue* of it, it must be confess'd, that our Saviour shed his *Blood* for the salvation of *all men.* But if we look at the *fruit* which *men gather from thence*, we may easily understand that it comes *not to all* to advantage, but only to *some*. When therefore he said, *'For you,'* he signifi'd either them that were then *present*, or those whom he had *chosen* out of the *Jewish* people, such as were his *Disciples*, except *Judas*, with whom he spake. But when he added, *'For many,'* he would have the *rest* that were elected, either *Jews* or *Gentiles*, to be understood. Rightly therefore was it done, that it was not said *'for all,'* seeing that in this place the design of the discourse extends only to the *fruits* of the *Passion*, which brought the Fruit of Salvation *only to the elect.'*
>
> (The foregoing transcription has the emphasized words and phrases shown as they appear in the original text.)

43. In this excerpt just quoted the wording 'for all' is explicitly singled out as being contrary to the 'design of the discourse,' that is, contrary to the mind of Christ when He said 'for many,' meaning not all men, but only the elect who are the only ones who actually benefit from the fruits of the Passion, namely, 'the Fruit of Salvation.'

44. Chapter Three, entitled: 'No Right Whatsoever,' of the argument, *Res Sacramenti*, shows that the Church is not patient of such a change, a change, that is, from 'for many' to 'for all.'

45. *Suggestio falsi* is often accompanied by another deformation called *supressio veri.* And so it is here.

Once the *suggestio falsi* has been engineered, no mention is made of a relevant truth, in this case viz. that even if the terms are archaic, archaic terms still mean something. Archaic terms mean today what they meant yesterday. They stand for a reality, which reality has to be dealt with. You have sailed past that reality as though it did not exist. Thereby a truth is suppressed. Hence: *supressio veri.*

46. In your eighth paragraph you state: 'What we preserve is the "substance" because ...'

For this assertion to be relevant it has to refer to the form of the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist since the form of the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist is the subject matter with which we are dealing.

47. Since the form of the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist, in common with all the sacraments, comprises words, you have to be saying that we preserve the substance of the words of the form. That is to say that whereas we once said 'which shall be shed for many' but now say 'it will be shed for all' the substance of the reality which the old form signified with its words, is now preserved and signified in the saying of the new form using the new words.

48. That is tantamount to saying that 'for many' and 'for all' mean the same thing. That is a startling assertion. It is obvious that 'for many' and 'for all' do not mean the same thing in ordinary parlance. 'The ship sank but many were saved' is clearly communicating information different from that communicated by the report: 'The ship sank but all were saved.' The contrast is perhaps better shown by: 'The ship sank, many perished' compared with 'The ship sank, all perished.'

49. It is unlikely that you intend to convey the idea that 'for many' and 'for all' mean the same thing. Such a singular opinion would remain precisely that, viz. singular, and the burden of proof would be most decidedly thrown back on you.

Quite what you mean is, I believe, obliquely hinted at in your next paragraph,viz.: 'What you have neglected in your dissertation is the Church herself.'

It is when I read that, your ninth paragraph, that the suspicion, which had been growing on me as I read your letter, that you had not read the argument you were seeking to refute, changed from suspicion to certitude.

50. Far from neglecting the Church herself, the whole of Chapter Three of the argument is given over to what the Church teaches on precisely this matter. You simply could not have read Chapter Three with your intellect engaged and then have writen: 'What you have neglected ..... is the Church herself.' A nominalist could have done it but with a nominalist rational argument is impossible.

51. What I think I detect, faintly, faintly signalled is that you think that the Church can do anything, that it is enough for the Church to say 'for all' and that makes it all right. That is a

novelty unknown to sacramental theology and, indeed contradicted by it. Holy Eucharist is one of the two sacraments instituted by Christ *in specie*, that is to say, instituted by Christ in such fashion as to leave nothing to the Church to do but obey by using the matter identified by Christ and by pronouncing the form He provided.

52. When you write: 'What we preserve is the "substance" because that is the deposit of revelation' you intend the reader to conclude, as I have mentioned above, that 'for all' preserves the substance of what obtained before, viz. 'for many.'

53. The term 'substance' is not an elastic term; it is in no way vague. It is, on the contrary, extremely precise, especially in this area with which we are presently concerned, viz. the form of the sacraments.

54. Pope Pius XII expatiated on the matter in his Apostolic Constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis*. He writes:

> 'As the Council of Trent teaches, the seven sacraments of the New Law have all been instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and the Church has no power over the substance of the sacraments, that is over those things which, with the sources of divine revelation as witnesses, Christ the Lord himself decreed to be preserved in a sacramental sign.'

In this extract from the Apostolic Constitution of Pope Pius XII we are instructed as to the sense of the term 'substance' in the phrase 'substance of the sacraments.'

'Substance', as in 'substance of the sacraments,' in that Apostolic Constitution, is

a) that to which divine revelation witnesses and

b) that which our Lord himself decrees to be preserved in a sacramental sign.

Over this 'substance of the sacraments,' it is stated: 'the **Church has no power**.' (my emphasis)

55. That stated, it is alarming to note that the parts changed, namely 'for many' and 'unto the remission of sins' are witnessed to by divine revelation. Divine revelation is to be found in the Bible and in Tradition. 'For many' is witnessed to by Matthew and by Mark and 'unto the remission of sins' is witnessed to by Matthew. So far as tradition is concerned the Latin rite has never known any form other than '*... for many unto the remisssion of sins.*'

56. As to our Lord's decreeing that which is to be preserved in a sacramental sign we have our Lord's words: 'Do this in my commemoration' (Luke 22:19). The 'this' which we are to do in his commemoration is, *inter alia*, to pronounce the words 'for many' and 'unto the remission of sins,' when reciting the sacramental form over the chalice.

57. It must be concluded therefore that 'for many' and 'unto the remission of sins' pertain to the substance of the sacrament since they are both, a) witnessed to by Holy Writ, which is part of divine revelation, and b) required by our Lord to be preserved in the sacramental sign.

58. It follows that the excision of 'for many' and 'unto the remission of sins' is an attentat on the substance of the sacrament. Since the Church has 'no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching the substance of the sacraments,' (Pope St Pius X, *Ex quo nono*) there is clearly some skullduggery afoot.

59. Further, it is to be noted that the parts which have been inserted in place of the excised parts are **not** witnessed to by divine revelation, for they are to be found neither in Holy Writ nor in tradition and have **not** been decreed by our Lord as requiring to be preserved in the sacramental sign. From this it may be concluded that the insertions are alien to the substance of the sacrament. From this it may, in turn, be concluded that there has been further skullduggery.

60. It results therefore that your assertion: 'What we preserve is the "substance" because that is the deposit of the revelation' does not correspond to the reality. The reality is that revelation has been rejected, the substance has been taken away and a counterfeit put in its place.

Chapter IV, 'How it happened' at page 76 of the booklet *Res Sacramenti* describes how this outrage was effected and identifies the devastator responsible.

61. Your tenth paragraph reads: 'What you have relied upon has been a traditional formula that had its validity only from ecclesiastical approbation.'

Your use of the term 'formula' could comprise both matter and form of the sacrament but since I am arguing exclusively about the form and you are responding to that argument, I shall take the term 'formula' as applying to the form, that is to say, applying to 'This is my body' and 'This is the chalice of my blood etc.'

62. What is affirmed in your tenth paragraph is not Catholic doctrine. No ecclesiastical entity can charge the sacrament of Holy Eucharist with validity by granting its approbation. The validity of a sacrament derives from Christ. The Church receives the sacraments from God who wills to confer them on the Church and for that purpose instituted all seven, as Trent says, 'immediately.' The Church does not validate them. The Church cannot validate them. That the Church cannot validate the sacraments is a conclusion which follows necessarily from the fact that the Church has 'no power whatsoever over the substance of the sacraments.'(*Vide*: chapter 3 of the argument, *Res Sacramenti, passim*).

Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary has:

> 'The Council of Trent defines that though the Church may change rites and ceremonies, it cannot alter the 'substance' of the sacraments. This follows from the very nature of a sacrament. The matter and form have no power in themselves to give grace. **This power depends solely on the will of God**, who has made the grace promised depend on the use

> of **certain things and words, so that if these are altered in their essence the sacrament is altogether absent.**' (My emphasis)

Catholic doctrine on this matter is succinctly given in Chapter 3 of the argument *Res Sacramenti*.

63. To affirm that the validity of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist derives from ecclesiastical approbation is to go counter to the Council of Trent, which, adhering to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, the apostolic traditions and the consensus of the Fathers professes that 'the sacraments of the new law were all instituted by Jesus Christ.'

64. It is theologically certain that all the sacraments were instituted by Christ immediately. That is to say that they came, each and everyone of them, from Him. From that however it does not necessarily follow that He determined personally all the details of the sacred ceremony. Immediate institution by Christ allows that He could have limited Himself to determining what special graces were to be conferred by means of external rites without further elaborating what He wanted done.

65. For five of the seven sacraments that, in fact, is what happened. The Lord instituted them, as they say, *in genere*. He limited himself to determining the grace that was to be conferred but left to the Church to determine what He had not.

66. It transpires however that for two sacraments, namely, Baptism and Holy Eucharist, **he did determine minutely (*in specie*) the matter and form.** He left **nothing** for the Church to do except follow His instructions.

67. St Thomas has, in this connection, the following cautionary word:

> 'The other point to be considered is the meaning of the words. For since in the sacraments, the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey, as stated above, we must see whether the change of words destroys the essential sense of the words: because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid.' (S.Th. III, Q.60, Art. 8)

68. There is something to note about the above cautionary word. In all the sacraments except Holy Eucharist the minister has an act to perform in addition to pronouncing the required words of the form. For example, pouring water in baptism, anointing with chrism in confirmation and in holy orders the imposition of hands, etc., which constitute the matter of that sacrament. But in the sacrament of Holy Eucharist the priest has no act to perform except the pronouncing of the necessary words (S.Th. III, Q.78, Art.1).

69. Moreover, the power of the form of this sacrament is derived solely from the fact that the words spoken by the priest are the exact words of our Lord. Saint Thomas has:

> 'But the form of this sacrament is pronounced as if Christ were speaking in person, so that it is given to be understood that the minister does nothing in perfecting this sacrament, except to pronounce the words of Christ.' (S.Th. III, Q.78, Art. 1)

And also:

> 'Ambrose says (*De Sacramentis iv*): the consecration is accomplished by the words and expressions of the Lord Jesus. ... When the time comes for perfecting the sacrament, the priest uses no longer his own words, but the words of Christ.' (*Ibid*)

70. Our Lord did not institute inchoate sacraments, that is to say, sacraments which lacked validity, to which sacraments lacking validity the ecclesiastical entity then communicated validity by granting its approbation.

71. Your eleventh paragraph reads: 'The sacraments are not merely "signs." They are also "symbols", and that has a much richer connotation.'

Taking your eleventh paragraph in context, which is the context of my arguing that 'for all' invalidates the *Novus Ordo* procedure and of your arguing that it does not, I respond by stating that I have never said that the sacraments are 'merely "signs."'

72. When one has given the definition of a sacrament (*Signum sensibile, efficax gratiae, a Christo institutum*) in the first chapter of a work it may be permitted to speak thereafter of sacraments as signs without the qualifications found in the definition, that is to say, without reproducing the entire definition every time one wishes to refer to a sacrament as a sign.

73. When therefore I refer to a sacrament as a sign and add nothing else to the term 'sign' I am not to be taken as intending *merely* a sign, as though I were abandoning the qualifications earlier affirmed, viz. that the sign is *sensibile* (perceptible by the senses), *efficax gratiae* (efficacious of grace) and *a Christo institum* (instituted by Christ).

74. However, that said, it is probable that by the adverb *merely*, which may mean *absolutely* or *without qualification* you intend the meaning conveyed by the adverb *only*. That is suggested by your adding to the mix: 'They are also symbols...', thereby affirming that the sacraments are *signs* and *symbols*. I am assuming therefore, that by the term *merely* you intend to convey the meaning *only*, so that your text can read : 'The sacraments are not *only* signs. They are also symbols, ...'

75. I am dismayed that you should be using the term *symbol* in this context of Holy Eucharist. When heretics take over a word (they have taken over *symbol*) and use it to contradict Catholic doctrine (e.g. transubstantiation, as in *Mysterium Fidei* of Paul VI, as in Trent and elsewhere abundantly) the word, though perfectly good and innocent in itself, may not prudently be used unqualified without importing into the exchange the taint of heresy it has been elsewhere used to support.

76. To use the term *symbol* in the context of Holy Eucharist and similarly to use the term *sign* but without qualification, at least understood, (such as the qualifications: *sensibile, efficax gratiae, a Christo institutum*) is to resurrect the thousand year old heresy of Archdeacon Berengarius of Tours who viewed the sacrament of Holy Eucharist 'as a mere sign or symbol' of Christ.

77. By *mere* he meant strictly that, viz. a sign or a symbol and nothing more, in other words he meant a sign (or a symbol) which signified but, unlike our sacraments, did **not effect that which it signified**. He said: 'That which is consecrated (the bread) is not able to cease existing materially.'

78. So, according to Berengarius the bread and the wine are still there after the consecration. That the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist should be held to be a sacrament in that sense is contrary therefore to the teaching of Leo XIII:

> 'All know that the sacraments of the New Law, being sensible signs which cause invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they cause and cause the grace which they signify.'

79. After Berengarius recanted by taking the oath prepared for him by Pope St Gregory VII, nothing more was heard of *symbol* until the advent of Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531) who is most celebrated for his rejection of any form of Eucharistic presence of Christ, either *in* the sacrament (transubstantiation or consubstantiation) or received *with* the sacrament (virtualism or receptionism).

80. Zwingli held that the bread and wine were symbols only (*corpus et sanguinem nonnisi symbolicos accipi*). Various Reformers (Cranmer, Knox, Bucer and others) adopted the Zwinglian theory of the Eucharist. These personages were saying that the substance of the bread remains.

81. Trent (1545-1563) moved on the matter and, in harmony with St Thomas, infallibly taught:

> If anyone says that in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine ... and denies that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and of the entire substance of the wine into the Blood, the species of the bread and wine only remaining, a change which the Catholic Church most fittingly calls transubstantiation: let him be anathema. (*Denz.* No.884, 30th ed.)

82. Despite Trent, the 'symbol' heresy festered here and there and by the time of Pope St Pius X had enough public presence and vigour to bring down upon it *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*. That magisterial encyclical, by its detailed analysis, revealed the huge deceit of *Modernism*, that 'compendium of all heresies,' as St Pius called it.

83. The term *symbol* is much favoured by Modernists. For them dogmas are symbols. For them dogmas do not contain the truth. They cannot contain the truth because they are *symbols*, that is, they are images of truth and images need to be adjusted according to needs. The criterion of what may be 'needs' is the *religious sense* arbitrarily posited by Modernists in man and capable of an infinity of forms. Consequently the formulas we call dogmas are liable to change. (#12)

84. Similarly with the sacraments. For the Modernists, sacraments are bare symbols or signs though not devoid of a certain efficacy. The efficacy however of which they speak is no more than that of suggestion, the power of putting certain leading ideas into circulation and of making a marked impression upon the mind.

According to St Pius X what the Modernist really means is that the sacraments are instituted solely to foster the faith. Modernists will not say that however in as many words because precisely that opinion has been condemned by Trent: 'If anyone says that these sacraments are instituted solely to foster the faith, let him be anathema.' (Sess. VII, *De Sacramentis in genere*, can. 5). Not that a Modernist cares a fig for Trent, but he won't run unnecessary risks.

85. With *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, the *Modernist* juggernaut slowed its headlong onslaught on the faith, but it did not stop. It continued burrowing away. One of its burrows had written above the entrance: '*Symbol.*' Paul VI took it in his stride. In *Mysterium Fidei* he taught that it is wrong to treat of the conversion of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the whole substance of the Body and Blood of Christ 'as if they involve nothing more than "transignification" or "transfinalization" as they call it.'

Pope Paul VI did not merely state the truth. He explained it, limpidly. He said:

> 'As a result of transubstantiation, the species of bread and wine undoubtedly take on a new signification and a new finality, for they are no longer ordinary bread and wine but instead a sign of something sacred and a sign of spiritual food; but they take on this new signification, this new finality, precisely because they contain a new "reality" which we can rightly call *ontological*. For what now lies beneath the aforementioned species is not what was there before, but something completely different; and not just in the estimation of Church belief but in reality, since once the substance or nature of the bread and wine has been changed into the body and blood of Christ, nothing remains of the bread and wine except for the species - beneath which Christ is present whole and entire in his physical "reality", corporeally present, although not in the manner in which bodies are in a place.'

86. The connection between transignification/finalization and *symbol* is that transignification and/or transfinalization leave the bread and wine intact. It was bread and wine before, it remains bread and wine after. So what function does the bread and wine then fulfill? That of a *symbol.*

87. This new theology of the Real Absence seems to stem from the deceased idealist Karl Rahner, S.J. at least as far as its philosophical underpinnings are concerned because Karl Rahner fashioned a new meaning of the term *substance*. This new meaning may be found in Rahner's *Encyclopedia of Theology*. This work states about the Eucharistic consecration:

> 'The more recent approaches suggest the following considerations. One has to remember that the words of institution indicate a change but do not give any guiding line for the interpretation of the actual process. As regards transubstantiation, it may then be said that substance, essence, *meaning and purpose* of the bread are identical. But the meaning of a thing can be changed without detriment to its matter.'

The *Encyclopedia* continues by describing what is effected by means of the consecration:

> '...the meaning of the bread has been changed through the consecration. Something which served profane use now becomes the dwelling-place and the *symbol* of Christ who is present and gives himself to his own. This means that an ontological change has taken place in the bread.'

88. These two preceding quotations from the *Encyclopedia* allow the following conclusions, viz. for Rahner, *substance* is now identified with the *'meaning and purpose'* of the thing, rather than a change in its physical being. That is to say, for Rahner, the consecration changes the *'meaning and purpose'* of the bread and wine, but not its form and matter or physical being. And an *ontological* change (i.e. a change in being) is, according to Rahner, a change in the *meaning and purpose* of the thing.

89. What has happened according to this view is that it is the *use* of the bread and wine and the *mind* of the celebrant and Christian community which has changed, not the bread and wine. The bread and wine remain just that, bread and wine. According to this view, one can speak of Christ as being *in the bread and wine*, and Karl Rahner does in fact say that (*Encyclopedia* pp.1754 - 1755) leaving the bread and wine still bread and wine but serving as simply a *symbol* of Christ for the community of worshipers.

90. Edward Schillebeeckx is in the same camp, holding as he does that the physical bread and wine still remain after the consecration. (Note: If I am required to support these assertions at greater length I am able to do so, but I do not see the need to do so here since the aberrations of Rahner and Schillebeeckx are widely spread and chronicled in considerable detail)

91. There are some grim consequences of the appeal to, or use of, *symbol*, in the area of Holy Eucharist, given the sheer volume and astonishingly wide dissemination of heterodox doctrine which commonly accompanies the term. Karl Rahner's and Edward Schillebeeckx's 'new' (it is in fact very old) theology of the real 'presence' was published in English in 1966 and has been taught in seminaries and universities around the world since, with quite predictable results.

92. It has reduced the Catholic presence in North America to some exiguous fraction of its former numbers. Joseph Cardinal Bernadin reported that 'according to a Gallup poll only 30% of our faithful believe what the Church teaches on the presence of Jesus in the Eucharist.'

93. We are dealing, of course, with transubstantiation, which means that we are dealing, of necessity, with *substance*, viz. that which inheres in itself and not in another. That is the teaching of Trent. Karl Rahner rejects that teaching and meaning. He thereby rejects Trent's infallible dogma on transubstantiation, and is in conflict with Paul VI in *Mysterium Fidei*.

94. If it is suggested that there is a way out by means of simply another way of understanding the same thing it must be kept in mind that another way of understanding the same thing is closed by the First Vatican Council's dogmatic teaching, which states that the 'understanding of its sacred dogmas must be perpetually retained' and that 'there must never be recession from that meaning.'

A 'meaning' cannot be given to the dogmas 'different from that which the Church understood and understands.' (*Denz.* # 1818, 30th edition)

95. Finally, there is a dread question to be canvassed. We know that the Eucharist is valid (*ex opere operato*) when it 'is celebrated in accordance with the intention of the Church' (CCC 1128). The intention of the Church is to do that which should be done to confect the sacrament. Hence the minimum requirement for validity on the part of the celebrant is to intend to do what the Church does (*intentionem, saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia*). That which the Church intends to do and does, as it explains in Trent, is to transubstantiate the elements, i.e. to change 'the whole substance of the bread into the body and the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, the species of the bread and the wine only remaining.'

96. Karl Rahner and Edward Schillebeeckx and those who follow them do not intend to do that, they intend to do something else. What they do leaves the bread and wine physically intact - on their own frank admission. They juggle with meanings.

97. Now it might be asserted that the executants of this novelty still say the same words, use the same matter so could it not be said that they were at least doing what the Church does? If it were said, that would leave out one necessary element, viz. the intention to do what the Church does.

98. Intention is formed according to one's understanding (*nil volitum nisi praecognitum*). Rahner and company understand, and intend to bring about, a change in meaning, just that and no more. They are perfectly familiar with the former, and still current (when it can be found) understanding, viz. that of Trent, and the intention which flowed from it, but they positively reject that understanding and with it the corresponding intention. Leaving aside for the nonce any other reason there may be for declaring their Masses invalid (*cf. Res Sacramenti*), their vitiated intention is enough by itself to invalidate the whole procedure.

99. A right intention is necessary for validity. The Church has condemned the following proposition:

> 'Baptism is valid when conferred by a minister who observes all the external rite and form of baptizing, but within his heart resolves, I do not intend what the Church does' (*Valet baptismus collatus a ministro, qui omnem ritum externum formamque baptizandi observat, intus vero in corde suo apud se resolvit: Non intendo, quod facit Ecclesia.*) *Denz.*#2328, 29th ed.: #1318, 30th ed.

100. In order to resolve within the heart that: 'I do not intend what the Church does', it is not necessary to articulate the intention in so many words. It suffices simply to refrain from intending what the Church does, then to intend instead something else which the Church does not and substitute that for what the Church does.

101. Since Rahner and company do not intend what the Church does, their Masses are invalid due to a defect in intention.

102. Hence my dismay at your use of the term *symbol* in the context of Holy Eucharist. The term *symbol* comes loaded with too much baggage, and aberrant baggage to boot, for the term to be used without further explanation as to quite what is intended by its use. It is apparent that you do not intend the term as simply a synonym for *sign*, for you affirm that 'symbols' have a much richer connotation than 'signs'. Rahner's and Schillebeeckx's elaborations are manifestly not an enrichment but an horrendous impoverishment banishing Christ's physical presence from our midst.

103. All that said, since your eleventh paragraph so far as I can see - I am quite open to instruction on the matter - serves in no way to prove that 'for all' is a valid form, I shall content myself with the scholastic disputant's response to an irrelevancy and say: *transeat* (let it pass).

104. Your twelfth paragraph reads: 'Humans have never lived in a merely "physical" universe. We live also in a "symbolic" universe in which language, myth, art, music and religion touch our souls.'

105. Analysing your statement: 'We live also in a "symbolic" universe' leads to the possible, (not therefore necessary) implied conclusion that you are using the term *symbol* (as in *symbolic*) to mean something that stands in the place of that of which it is a symbol, for example, a portrait may be described as a symbol of the sitter, bread and wine a symbol of the Lord.

106. The portrait does not signal (as in *sign*) the presence of the sitter, it represents the sitter. The bread and wine according to the 'new' understanding, do not signal the Lord, they represent him. It may be this contrast between *sign* and *symbol* that leads you to say in paragraph 11 that '...that (i.e.symbol) has a much richer connotation,' whereas the fact of the matter is that nothing has a richer connotation than an ***efficacious*** sign, i.e. a sign which produces that which it signifies.

107. A flag can be a symbol of a country, it does not *signal* the country, not at least primarily, it represents the country, but what is the good of a piece of rag if it turns out that you do not have the country? What is the good of bread and wine if you do not have the Lord? *Really* have him I mean, *really* as in *quoad ipsissimam rem.*

108. If you are using *symbolic* in that way, that is, in the way of representation and if you are not, as I suspect you are, straying from the argument: *for many* - valid; *for all* - invalid, then you are allying yourself with Rahner and company and exiting from the faith as propounded by Trent and the First Vatican Council, as explained above.

109. On the other hand, if the construction I have placed on your words: 'We live also in a "symbolic" universe', is wide of the mark, then those same words have no relevance to the matter being affirmed by me and disputed by you, viz. *for all* does not signify the *res sacramenti* whereas *for many* does signify the *res sacramenti.* If there is no *res sacramenti* there is no sacrament. If there is no sacrament there is no Mass. If your words have no relevance to the matter being affirmed by me and disputed by you, the proper response on my part is simply: *Transeat.*

110. Your thirteenth paragraph reads: 'The symbolism of the Eucharist is much broader than you describe. It has truly cosmic dimensions. These dimensions it has by divine institution and by the authenticating of the Church Catholic.'

111. These three sentences need to be taken one at a time. To take the first, first: 'The symbolism of the Eucharist is much broader than you describe.'

112. At no stage of the argument *Res Sacramenti* have I described the symbolism of Holy Eucharist. Describing the symbolism of the Eucharist is an exercise for Karl Rahner and company who are driven to it by their non-real philosophy (Karl Rahner was an idealist out of phenomenology by Modernism). Their description (which is actually the substance of their aberrant doctrine) is heretical, being contrary to Trent and the First Vatican Council as explained above.

113. What I am affirming is that there is **no** Eucharist in a *Novus Ordo* Mass and that because of a defect of form. Holy Eucharist is not a symbol of the Lord, it **is** the Lord, physically present as Paul VI states (*Mysterium Fidei*) under the appearance of bread and wine. The Host may, indeed *must*, be adored. In the Rahnerian system, adoration of the host could not but be idolatry.

114. It is not revealed in your text quite what you mean by 'broader.' Of course, by 'broader' you mean 'wider', i.e. embracing more elements, that is obvious enough, but what are these additonal elements? Since I am demonstrating the invalidity of the modern Mass in the vernacular and you are disputing that, you may mean by 'broader', sufficiently broad to accomodate 'for all' as a component of a valid form, so that Holy Eucharist may be produced either with the form containing the words 'for many' or with the form containing the words 'for all'.

115. If that is what you intend (I am guessing that that is what you intend) then it is not enough to imply that, you have to state it and then prove it. To prove it you have to prove that *for all* both signifies and effects the union of the Mystical Body. If that cannot be proved it will be because there is no *res sacramenti.* No *res sacramenti,* no sacrament, no sacrament, no Mass.

116. The second sentence reads: 'It has truly cosmic dimensions.' Unless that can be tied in with 'for all', what, pray, does that contribute? *Transeat.*

117. The third sentence reads: 'These dimensions it has by divine institution and by the authenticating of the Church Catholic.'

118. 'To authenticate' means variously: 'to invest with authority', 'give legal validity to', 'establish the validity of', 'establish the title to credibility of a statement or of a reputed fact', 'to establish the genuineness of'.

119. The authentication of which you write has to be the authentication of 'for all' in the form. That, after all, is what we are arguing about. Further, this authentication of 'for all' in the form is an authentication, you allege, effected by the Catholic Church. That is to say that the Church makes 'for all' in the form right and proper and it does that, by authenticating it and thereby

establishing the validity of it, just as, in a former time, you would affirm, it authenticated or established the validity of, *for many.*

120. This appears to be a reiteration of your tenth paragraph which refers in part to: 'a traditional formula that had its validity only from ecclesiastical approbation.' The two phrases 'ecclesiastical approbation' and 'the authenticating of the Church Catholic' are similar and appear to enshrine the same principle. I have already dealt with 'ecclesiastical approbation' above, at #61 *et sqs* . What I wrote above applies equally well to 'the authenticating of the Church Catholic.' At this point therefore I am not concerned, in this immediate context, with the merits of such terminology or the principle on which it rests, I am concerned instead with a conclusion which flows from its use.

121. The new 'form' for the consecration of the wine alleges that Our Lord said: 'to be shed for you and for *all men* ... etc.' There is no evidence, either in Holy Scripture or in Tradition, that Our Lord said this when instituting the sacrament of Holy Eucharist. Moreover, all the evidence there is on this matter, indicates that he did **not** say *'for all men'* when instituting this Most Holy Sacrament. People who would be expected to know, and to have got it right in reporting the event, give the lie to *'for all men.'*

122. St Matthew (26:28) writes that He said *'for many.'* It is helpful to recall that St Matthew was actually there where He said whatever it was He said and actually heard whatever it was He said. Having been there at the time and having heard what was said, St Matthew reports that what He said was *'for many.'*

123. St Mark concurs. He records that Our Lord said *'for many'*. Nowhere in Holy Scripture - neither in St Paul nor in the Evangelists - do we find that Our Lord said: *'for all men.'* If St Matthew and St Mark were divinely inspired to write what they wrote, does that not put the seal on what He did in fact say?

124. Am I to conclude that we have been wrong all these centuries holding Him to have said *for many*? Must I reject Matthew and Mark plus nineteen centuries of Fathers and Doctors of the Church, Popes, Bishops, theologians and Scripture scholars and give my preference to an 'enlightened' clutch of twentieth century Modernists and innovators, whose ignorance and incompetence in this matter, which they have arrogantly taken in hand, has been demonstrated beyond cavil of doubt?

125. I refer to the farce, perpetrated by ICEL and documented in *Res Sacramenti*, pp. 63, at #132 *sqs*, of Aramaic not having a word for *all*, (it has) so that Our Lord was hampered in saying what He wanted to say (He wasn't), which according to the wreckers, was *all*, (it wasn't) and had to settle for a word (He didn't) the same wreckers arbitrarily identify as *Rabbim.* (*Rabbim*? Hey! Wait a minute. *Rabbim* is a Hebrew word. What is a Hebrew word doing in an Aramaic context to begin with? No matter! Nobody will notice!)

126. *Rabbim*, Hebrew for *multitude* is a word arbitrarily chosen by these linguistic wizards because it suited their purpose which was, one way or another, to have Our Lord say, no matter what He actually did say, whatever that was (they wouldn't know, nor are they interested in

knowing because they have an *agenda*) but mean by what He said: *all*. *Rabbim* with its hint of ambiguity (many/all) was just what was required, never mind that it was Hebrew and that Aramaic has an unequivocal word for *all*. (For that matter, so has Hebrew an unequivocal word for *all*, it is exactly the same word as *all* in Aramaic - see next paragraph.)

127. If those sacrilegious, arrogant devastators had only thought to look up an Aramaic dictionary or at least get someone to do it for them, since they cannot be relied upon even to write grammatically correct English, - *vide: Res Sacramenti*, p.64 # 135 - let alone pontificate on Hebrew and Aramaic, they would have found *kol*, which means *all*, and derivatives, as in *kolla*, which means *everyone* or ***ALL MEN***. That is the word they said did not exist in Aramaic. But, but, but, but, but, **they were not interested in the truth, they were interested only in implementing their *agenda*,** and in that they have been phenomenally successful.

128. Not only has Aramaic a word for *all*, it has also a word for *many*. That word is *Saggueeia* and that is the precise word found in the venerable Peshito (Peschitto) which is the earliest dated Syriac (Aramaic) biblical manuscript. St Ephrem, the great Eastern Doctor of the Church, who died in 373 A.D., wrote exegetical treatises in Syriac (Aramaic) and used the Peshito for his scriptural references. Matthew (26:28) and Mark (14:24) are the two scriptural sources of the word *many*. In both places the Peshito has the word *Saggueeia, many*, as contrasted with the other Aramaic word *kolla* which means *all men*.

129. One doesn't have to go back to the first centuries to find *saggueeia*, meaning: *many*. Go to a Mass celebrated according to the Maronite rite and you will hear *saggueeia* when the priest recites the form over the chalice, for the Maronites have, since the beginning, said the form for the consecration of the elements in Aramaic.

130. I have said it before, it bears repeating: The Mass you are saying is based on a colossal error. Not Pope Paul's error. Pope Paul got it right. He legislated *pro multis*. It is not Paul's Mass you are saying, it is Fred's. That is Fred as in Fred McManus, chief Pooh Bah of ICEL - I suppose he is retired now but when he was active he was a veritable dynamo and ubiquitous. Single minded and of formidable gifts of management and administration, practically single handed he wrecked the Church in the West. He did have helpers but his was the guiding genius.

You can check all of this out in *Res Sacramenti* Chapter IV.

131. Even in ordinary writing or oratory, careful scholars are diligent in using the exact words of another person when attributing to him a quotation. How much more diligence is demanded when attributing a direct quotation to Our Lord. St Thomas Aquinas writes: 'It is not lawful to add even words to Holy Scripture as though such words were a part thereof, for this would amount to forgery.' (*S.Th.* III, Q.60. Art.8)

132. Now the authors of this new committee-generated 'Canon' boldly and mendaciously claim that Our Lord said something which He clearly and obviously **did not** say. The text of this new rite reads precisely as follows:

'When supper was ended, He took the cup. Again He gave you thanks and praise, gave the cup to His disciples, and **SAID**: .....

and then follows what He is supposed to have said. What He is supposed to have said includes something He did not say. The something He did not, in fact, say, is:

*...for all, so that sins may be forgiven.*

133. This is a forgery. Forgery is the making of a false document (which includes any material alteration in a genuine document whether by addition, insertion, obliteration, erasure, removal, or otherwise) knowing it to be false with the intent that it shall in any way be used or acted upon as genuine. Forgery is complete as soon as the document is made with such knowledge and intent as aforesaid.

134. The forgery I have documented above is only the latest in a series of violations of the sacred consecration form. There had been prior to it at least six distinct changes, on three separate occasions. The original despoiled version of 1967 introduced the 'for all men so that sins may be forgiven.'

135. In the same 1967 version the consecration form for the wine was broken up into two separate sentences: the first sentence ending with the words 'the mystery of faith,' and the second beginning with the words, 'This blood is to be shed for you and for all men ... etc.' This unprecedented innovation is yet another, at least probable, source of invalidity, but more of that another time.

136. All the words following 'This is the chalice of My Blood' are determinations of the predicate; that is, they determine the essential signifying elements of the Sacrament by means of the uninterrupted recitation by the priest of the words of Christ. Consequently the discontinuity of the ICEL form, caused by stopping the recitation after several determinations have been expressed (that is, up to and through the words 'the mystery of faith'), and then resuming with a new sentence, interferes with the integrity of the entire expression. In all other sacraments the essential form is expressed in a single statement, wherein all the necessary signifying elements of the sacrament are contained in the one uninterrupted utterance.

137. One consequence, among several, of this breaking up of the form for the wine into two sentences is to make the blood which is to be poured out, the blood which is shed on the cross. Without doubt it is the same blood but Our Lord is not talking about shedding his blood on the cross. He is talking about pouring out his blood from the chalice. He is instituting a sacrament and that is what he is talking about. That is indicated by the verb chosen by the Evangelists (Matthew, Mark and Luke) to report the pouring. The verb chosen is *ekchunnomenon*, which does not carry the meaning of blood flowing from a wound but of a pouring out, as for example, from one vessel into another. During the celebration of the Eucharist the Lord's precious blood is 'poured out' of the chalice into the mouths of the faithful, who, of course are *many*, not *all*.

138. In the 'New Order' of the Mass, the *Novus Ordo Missae*, which was promulgated a couple of years later in 1969, the vitiated form comprising the two separate sentences was retained. However, the sentences themselves were changed in wording once again. The first sentence now completely omits (in spite of Innocent III in his *Cum Martha Circa*, about which, another time) the words 'the mystery of faith' and ends with the words 'new and everlasting covenant.'

139. The second sentence was changed from 'This blood is to be shed for you and for all men...etc.' to 'It will be shed for you and for all men...etc.' Observe the trivial alterations: 'It' instead of 'This blood' and 'will be shed' instead of 'is to be shed.' These trivialities serve a sinister purpose. By association in the same locution, they confer their triviality to the change, far from trivial, which has wrecked and is continuing to destroy the Church in the West. They serve to divert attention away from the real issue, namely the serious and invalidating change, 'for all men so that sins may be forgiven.'

140. In the same *Novus Ordo* of 1969, the words 'the Mystery of Faith' were deleted from the actual consecration form, as has been already mentioned, only to reappear afterwards outside the consecration itself in the form of an acclamation by the priest to which the congregation replies, 'Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again.'

141. These three truths have nothing whatsover to do with the mystery of faith of the Holy Eucharist, namely that that which was formerly wine and still has all the physical and chemical properties of wine is not wine, but is now the Precious Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity of Jesus Christ.

142. The wholly inappropriate reply by the congregation serves to suppress the dogma of the real presence. It does that by the simple device of changing the subject. At the precise moment when the Lord is made present, one's attention is immediately diverted to be fixed on a truth in no way germane to the matter in hand. The matter in hand is that God himself is there on the corporal, where, before, there was only bread and wine. That diversion is tantamount to denying the Real Presence.

143. The Roman Catechism explains the meaning of those words 'The Mystery of Faith' in the place they occupied before, viz. in the consecration form. The Catechism has: '...for it is called the mystery of Faith, because by Faith we perceive Christ's Blood hid under the species of wine.'

144. Another change was the appending of the words: 'which will be given up for you' to that part of the form looking to the consecration of the bread.

145. The final change (so far as I know) occurred in 1985 when ICEL changed their original 'for all men' to 'for all.' This change was official and mandatory. The reason? Political pressure exerted by feminists.

**146. Lest we forget, we are talking about the supposed sacred words of Jesus Christ in the supposed Catholic Mass, we are talking about what Christ is said to have <u>SAID</u>.**

147. The sacred words of Christ and the safeguarding of a valid Mass mean absolutely nothing to these vile wreckers. Casting an eye on the variety of changes in this part of the Mass presents us with one forgery after another.

148. Now that the material elements of the matter have been identified let us return to your observation in your par.13: 'These dimensions it has by divine institution and by the authenticating of the Church Catholic' (emphasis added).

That 'authenticating by the Church Catholic' raises a question:

How does Holy Mother Church authenticate a forgery?

149. Your fourteenth paragraph reads:

> 'You have missed the bigger mystery of the Church as the body of Christ in your concentration on the sacramental presence, forgetting that there is a sacramental presence only because the whole Church is *a kind of sacrament or sign of intimate union with God [Lumen Gentium p.1].*'

150. This utterance needs to be taken a piece at a time. (Note: I have supplied the word *Mystical* in the following sentence because I assume that is the Body you are referring to) It begins: You have missed the bigger mystery of the Church as the (Mystical) Body of Christ.

151. That is an astounding assertion. The **whole** of the argument *Res Sacramenti* is about the Mystical Body and its deliberately engineered absence through the sacrilegious novelty *for all*. How can I have missed 'the bigger mystery of the Church as the body of Christ' since, in the argument you are responding to, I have written about nothing else? Even the title of the work testifies to that. The title (*Res Sacramenti*) of the work is a term used to designate the union of the Mystical Body.

152. It is not only astounding, it is also an example of the fallacy *ignoratio elenchi*. We are not talking about the same thing. I am talking about the invalidity, through a defect of form, of the *Novus Ordo Missae* as mediated to us in the vernacular.

153. The defect consists in this. Part of the valid form, viz. *for many*, which signifies the Mystical Body, has been excised from the form and its place has been taken by *for all*, which cannot signify the Mystical Body. The union of the Mystical Body is the sacramental grace (*Res Sacramenti*) of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist. If the union of the Mystical Body is not signified one does not have a sacrament. If there is no sacrament there is no Mass.

154. *For all* is a liturgical novelty. There is no trace of it in the history of the Church, or even outside the Church for that matter, amongst the heretics and schismatics. It is without precedent in tradition. It is inspired by *universalism* but above all, as stated in the preceding paragraph, **it does not signify the union of the Mystical Body**, with the result that the form, now mutilated

and rendered sacramentally incompetent, cannot effect the *res sacramenti*. No *res sacramenti*, no sacrament, no sacrament, no Mass.

To effect, i.e. to produce, the *res sacramenti* (i.e. the union of the Mystical Body) is the very reason the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist was instituted in the first place.

155. It is apparent to me that you are not talking about any of that. You are talking about things I am supposed to have, respectively, neglected, missed and forgotten but you do not point to and identify the consequences of neglecting, missing and forgetting whatever it is I am supposed to have neglected, missed and forgotten. The things I am supposed to have neglected etc. are relevant only if their inclusion in the argument, that is to say, their not being neglected, their not being missed and their not being forgotten, will lead to the conclusion that *for all* does not invalidate the form. But they do not do that, that is to say, they do not lead to the conclusion that *for all* does not invalidate the form. The matters which you aver have been neglected and/or missed and/or forgotten are matters not germane to the contested issue.

156. Reading between your lines, I have formed the opinion, that your stating that I have neglected this, forgotten that, and missed this other, derives from a conviction I am presuming you have, that what I have allegedly neglected, forgotten and missed is sufficient to render the changed form competent to produce the whole Christ, Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity.

157. When then you say: 'What you have neglected in your dissertation is the Church herself' (your paragraph 9) you are presumably implying that in some way - you do not specify the way - the Church herself will lend efficacy to the mutilated form; in other words, that something approximating the supply of jurisdiction as in *Ecclesia supplet* will be conjured up to supply validity when validity cannot arise by force of the words (not Our Lord's words be it noted, Fred's words) used.

158. I suppose that when you say that I have missed the bigger mystery of the Church as the Body of Christ (your par.14) you are implying the same thing, viz. that the Church, against all expectations, **can** make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, that is to say **can** take and use *for all* and make it mean *for many*.

159. I hope you are not implying that because the fact of the matter is that the Church can do nothing of the kind. Chapter Two of *Res Sacramenti* (page 49 *sqs*) contains the refutation of that bit of foolishness. Language is antecedent to the institution of the Sacraments. Nor can the Church ('Church' in this immediate context means Fred McManus as is explained in excruciating detail in Chapter Four of *Res Sacramenti* p.77) simply ignore the difference between *for all* and *for many* and 'box on' as it were. It cannot do that because *for all* does not signify the *res sacramenti* which is the union of the Mystical Body. No *res sacramenti*, no sacrament. No sacrament, no Mass.

160. The sacrament of Holy Eucharist was instituted by Christ *in specie*. All that remains for the Church to do is to do what Christ instructed the Church to do. And to make sure that what He

said was to be done would be done, the Church enjoined on all, the following, which is taken from Part V of *De Defectibus in Celebratione Missarum Occurrentibus:*

> 'The words of consecration which are the form of this Sacrament, are these: *Hoc est enim Corpus Meum.* And: *Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.* Now if one were to omit, or to change anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in that very change of the words the (new) wording would fail to mean the same thing, he would not consecrate the Sacrament. If in fact he were to add something that did not change the meaning, it is true he would consecrate, but he would sin gravely.'

161. *For all* has absolutely **nothing** to support it. The Catechism of the Council of Trent explicitly rejects this precise phrase, and explains why. 'With reason therefore,' the Catechism teaches, 'were the words "for all" not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion alone are spoken of and to the elect only (i.e. *for many*) did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation.'

162. Two Doctors of the Church, St Thomas Aquinas (*Summa,* III. Q.78, Art.3) and St Alphonsus de Liguori (Treatise on the Holy Eucharist) give the theological reasons why *for all* is improper in this place. The Sovereign Pontiff Benedict XIV in his *De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio,* Bk.II, Ch. XV, par 11, ratified the teaching of St Thomas on this point, asserting that the Angelic Doctor 'explains correctly' Christ's use of *for many* as opposed to *for all.*

163. The next part of your fourteenth paragraph reads: '... in your concentraton on the sacramental presence.' The only reason I am concentrating on the sacramental presence is because on inspection I find that the sacramental presence has turned into a sacramental absence. That has to be dealt with. 'The bigger mystery of the Church as the Body of Christ' is irrelevant if I am bending over the chalice and saying something but not what He told me to say.

164. If I lean over the chalice and say something, but not what He told me to say, especially if what I say signifies falsely as does *for all,* (Holy Eucharist is not *for all,* but *for many* - the abuse of handing out Holy Commmunion to all comers is precisely that, namely, an abuse and from all I hear becoming more frequent) it is of no importance whether I miss or do not miss the bigger mystery of the Church as the Body of Christ. In either case I still end up with what I started, namely: wine.

165. The remainder of your fourteenth paragraph reads: (You are) 'forgetting that there is a sacramental presence only because the whole Church is *a kind of sacrament or sign of intimate union with God* [*Lumen Gentium* p.1].' (Your emphasis)

166. When the Church is described as a kind of sacrament or sign of intimate union with God the word 'sacrament' is employed by way of analogy with the seven sacraments properly so called. It is because of what we understand of the Sacraments that we understand something similar of the Church. The term 'sacrament' therefore results an analogous term, that is, a term which is predicated of many according to a signification substantially different but in some respect (the

*Schoolmen* use the phrase *secundum quid*) identical. Thus the term *healthy* is predicated of an animal, the air, one's pulse, complexion, medicine, food etc..

167. When it is predicated of an animal, the term *healthy* is used primarily and properly (i.e. it is proper to the animal to be healthy, the animal has the property of health). Whereas when the term *healthy* is used of the air, one's pulse, complexion, medicine, food etc., it is not proper to these items (air, pulse, complexion etc.) to be healthy, but health is predicated of these items because of the relationship they have with the reality which is properly and primarily called healthy. In my example that reality is an animal. When air, pulse, complexion etc are said to be healthy, the term *healthy* is predicated of these items analogously by an analogy of attribution, as distinct from the analogy of proportion.

168. It is the analogy of attribution which is employed when predicating of the Church that it is a kind of sacrament or sign. It is the sacraments as we ordinarily understand that word (Baptism, Confirmation etc.) that are *properly* and *primarily* sacraments, whereas to predicate of the Church that it is a sacrament is an improper (i.e. it is not a property of the Church that it be a sacrament) and secondary and analogous use of the term *sacrament*.

169. The English has '... the Church is a kind of sacrament or sign.' The English does not render exquisitely accurately the Latin. The Latin reads: *Cum autem Ecclesia sit in Christo veluti sacramentum seu signum et instrumentum intimae cum Deo unionis totiusque generis humanitatis...*

170. The English is in the indicative mood (it is), the Latin in the subjunctive (it may be), a different construction. The English word *kind*, as in 'the Church is a *kind* of sacrament or sign of etc..' is an attempt to translate *veluti* which would be better translated '*as it were*' so that the sentence should read: 'Since however the Church may be, as it were, a sacrament or sign and instrument of the intimate union with God of the whole human race... etc..'

171. What the Latin is saying is that the Church may be considered as though it were a sacrament. That is different from saying that the Church is a sacrament. The Church may or may not be a sacrament but here, in *Lumen Gentium*, it is not being affirmed that it is a sacrament (but see CCC 774). What is being affirmed here is that it may be considered as though it were a sacrament and the vehicle by which this idea is conveyed is analogy, the analogy of attribution.

172. The idea behind this exercise is to give us a clearer vision of the Church. Everybody understands, more or less, what a sacrament is. Ideas as to what the Church is are much less clear. So, the use of analogy allows one to move from that which is better known, viz. the sacraments, to that which is less well known in its essence, viz. the Church.

173. Your assertion that there is a sacramental presence (I take it that by 'sacramental presence' you are refering to the 'real presence') only because the whole Church is a kind of sacrament, if construed according to the plain sense of the words used, conveys the idea of causality. Rearranging the word order for the sake of clarity you are saying that because the whole Church

is a kind of sacrament therefore there is a sacramental presence. As though the Church's being a kind of sacrament meant, somehow, that it sprouted sacraments like a rose bush sprouts roses.

174. If that is what you are implying then how to explain that the sacrament of Holy Eucharist was instituted before the Church? How can an effect precede its cause? On the other hand if you are not implying what your text appears to indicate that you are implying, what is the relevance of my supposed forgetting (or 'remembering' for that matter) that with which I am charged with forgetting? How would remembering what I have supposedly forgotten lead, and by what train of reasoning, to the conclusion that *for all* effects the *res sacramenti*?

175. Your fifteenth paragraph is quite unexceptionable. I am delighted at the opportunity it gives me of agreeing with you. Of course it was only to the Church (actually Peter, but 'Church' is near enough) that the promise was made, *I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven .. whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven*, (Matt.16:19), but what pray is the relevance of that?

176. Are you hinting obliquely that the Church can change at will the form of a sacrament which has been instituted *in specie*? Are you suggesting that the wreckers of the Church in the West can tinker (they've had six shots at it already as documented above) with the substance of the sacraments, despite the plain teaching, on this precise matter, of the Popes quoted verbatim above and at length in Chapter Three of *Res Sacramenti*?

177. *A propos* of tinkering, it looks as though it may be coming to an end, or, at least, the way is opening to permit its coming to an end. *Liturgiam Authenticam* released 7th May, 2001 over the signature of Cardinal Jorge Estevez, Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, and confirmed and ordered published by the Pope, requires new translations of the Roman Missal, Liturgy of the Hours, Roman Ritual and possibly of the Bible (another happy hunting ground for the wreckers). Not only; it requires, *mirabili dictu*, that the new translations be translations, i.e. accurate renderings of the meaning of the texts of which they purport to be translations.

178. The text I have before me as I type is not perfectly clear but it seems to be requiring, at least on principle if not in so many words, *for you and for MANY*. Apparently thirty years of feckless irresponsibility in the administration of the Church's most precious treasure may be about to cease - not that I am holding my breath. As it unhappily happens however, *for all* is not the only invalidating element of the *Novus Ordo* as mediated to us in the vernacular but it is the most obvious. So, one down or hopefully soon to be down, three to go.

179. Your sixteenth paragraph contains: '... the liturgy was fluid and variable in many of its details.' This utterance is of a generality so wide it lacks relevance, therefore nothing is conceded by responding: *transeat*.

180. Is the liturgy so fluid, as to permit *for all*, which He did not say and did not command to be said, in place of what He did say and did command to be said, namely: *for many*, and still effect transubstantiation? If it is then that needs to be demonstrated, not merely affirmed, and the argument to the contrary refuted, not merely rejected.

181. Is the liturgy so variable as to permit the design of the discourse as constructed by Our Lord in the words of institution to be changed from signalling efficacy in the forgiving of sins (*unto the remission of sins*) to one of sufficiency (*so that sins may be forgiven*)? If it is, let it be demonstrated!

182. Your sixteenth paragraph affirms further that the texts were not stabilised. The assertion that the texts were not stabilised needs to be distinguished. If you intend to affirm that the texts instituted *in specie* (Baptism and Holy Eucharist) were not stabilized from the beginning you will find it impossible to prove and will find yourself in opposition to the **whole** of tradition. If you intend to affirm that the texts other than those instituted *in specie* were not stabilized, then the proper response is: *transeat.*

183. Your sixteenth paragraph continues: '... and the ceremonies were developed in the course of long centuries.' *Transeat.* I, for one, am not talking about *ceremonies* but about the *form* of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist. However, if by the term *ceremonies* you intend to include also the form of the sacrament then it is appropriate and required to point out that the change from *for many* to *for all* is not a development, it is a substitution of one thing meaning what it means, by another thing meaning something different and comes therefore under the provision made for just such an eventuality by *De Defectibus in Celebratione Missarum Occurrentibus,* Part *V.* which says:

> Now if one were to omit, or to change anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in that very change of the words the (new) wording would fail to mean the same thing, he would not consecrate the Sacrament. (*De Defectibus,* Part *V*).

184. Your seventeenth paragraph has: 'The Liturgy... is the property of the Church, under whose guiding care and watchful eye it developed.' This utterance is altogether unexceptionable and remains forever true but does not form the subject matter of this debate.

185. In this context that utterance is another example of the fallacy *ignoratio elenchi.* We appear not to be talking about the same thing. When you say '...it developed' you appear not to advert to the fact that a substitution of what was there before by something that was not there before is not a development, it is in very fact a substitution.

186. Pope Paul's Mass has, as you would expect it to have, and as nineteen hundred years of tradition would require it to have: '... *pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.*' That is not the Mass that you are saying. You are not saying Pope Paul's Mass. You are saying Fred's 'mass', that is, the 'mass' concocted by Monsignor Frederick McManus, an interloper who, in ways explained in detail in Chapter Four of *Res Sacramenti*, with a mere half-dozen words, (... *for all so that sins may be forgiven*) struck right to the heart and destroyed the Mass in the West.

187. If it seems to you beyond belief that such a disaster could have been effected, if you are relying on a supposed approval by the Church, which, you opine, therefore makes everything all right, then I ask you to read Chapter Four of *Res Sacramenti*. If you propose reading that chapter then I suggest as preliminary reading, paragraphs 49,50,51, a mere thirteen lines, to be found on page 53 of the booklet *Res Sacramenti*. These three paragraphs identify the issues.

188. Your eighteenth paragraph needs to be reproduced *in toto*. It reads:

> 'The Eucharist is a sacrament and is not dependent on a formula but upon the authentication by the Church which prescribes its ritual in accordance with the revelation.'

189. Before proceeding to an analysis of this brief paragraph, I preface what I have to say by explaining that I understand your use of the word 'formula' is as a synonym for 'form'. I am confident that that is what you intend, because there does not appear to be any other possibility, but should it be that you intend something else I shall need to be instructed in the mattter.

190. Your eighteenth paragraph may be broken up into several clauses, four in all. The first clause reads: 'The Eucharist is a sacrament.'

I am thankful we agree on something. This is the second time we have reached agreement in the course of this correspondence. The first time was with your paragraph fifteen at #175 above.

191. The second clause reads: '(The Eucharist) is not dependent on a formula.' But that is precisely what it is dependent on. That is not to say that it is not also dependent on other realities such as a validly ordained priest, the right intention in the celebrant and right matter, but you could have all that and if you did not use the correct form, you would not confect the sacrament as is abundantly testified to by everything ever written on the subject. (*Vide*, for example, Addis and Arnold and Part V of *De defectibus* at #62 and #160 above respectively)

It is common teaching that Holy Eucharist is one of the two sacraments instituted *in specie*. By this it is to be understood that there is nothing for the Church to do but to obey Our Lord's prescriptions in the matter.

192. This is so abundantly testified to by Tradition, Magisterium, Doctors, theologians, Popes and the whole of the *Corpus Theologicum*, that I quail at the thought of the pages and pages I should have to write if I were to undertake to supply chapter and verse of the army of authorities who unanimously hold that Holy Eucharist **is** dependent on a formula. (I am assuming, as above, that when you say 'formula' you intend me to understand 'form.')

193. Because I simply have not the energy and stamina to undertake such a work, let alone the time, may I ask you to supply just **one** authority in support of your astonishing novelty: '(The Eucharist) is not dependent on a formula'?

In the meantime I refer you back to the few authorities already contained in this writing. Such authorities as are indicated in Nos. 54, 58, 62, 67, 68, 69, 160, all of whom require that Holy Eucharist is dependent on a formula if they are to make sense. Please add to them the whole of Chapter 3 (it is only five pages) of *Res Sacramenti*, with its array of Popes, and when that is done, please consider the following quotation from *Quantae Curae* (1896) of Pope Leo XIII:

> 'All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they

> signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite - that is to say, in the matter and in the form - it still pertains **chiefly to the form**, since the matter is a part which is not determined by itself, **but which is determined by the form**. ... That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for a Sacrament, which omits what it must essentially signify.' (my emphasis)

194. The third clause reads: '(The Eucharist) is dependent upon the authentication by the Church.' This is a reiteration of your paragraph 10, dealt with in #61 *et sqs* above, and your paragraph 13, dealt with in #117 *et sqs* above.

195. When you write in your paragraph eighteen, that the Eucharist is dependent on the authentication by the Church I take it that you mean in paragraph eighteen what you mean in paragraph ten, viz. that Holy Eucharist is dependent on Church authentication for validity. If you do mean that, then you are requiring for a valid confection of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist, one element more than Holy Mother Church requires.

196. For validity of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist the Church requires a validly ordained priest, the right intention, the right matter, the right form. The right matter and the right form of Holy Eucharist are not excogitated by the Church. They are already determined by the Lord. Four elements therefore. I do not know for certain that you hold those four elements to be necessary, but assuming for the nonce that you do, it appears that you require in addition a fifth element, namely: authentication by the Church.

197. The Lord of heaven and earth, God the Son, instructs us to take bread and wine and say certain words which he identifies and requires us to use (*vide* #62 above, Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*) to produce certain identified effects, e.g. the Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity of Our Lord.

198. Is that procedure invalid until the Church gives its authentication, that is, invests it with validity? Is that not starkly, patently incongruous? If the Church authenticates the form and then only is the form valid, and valid only until the Church changes it, does the same perhaps apply to the matter? It is bread and wine today; can it be taro and coconut milk tomorrow? The Gadarine rush to inculturation in our day suggests that it could be but, if not why not? If the form can be changed, and the form gives definition to the matter, why may not the matter be changed?

199. The answer to the question; 'If not why not' is that the Church has no power over the substance of the sacraments, as is limpidly explained by Pope St Pius X, Pope Innocent III, Pope Clement VI, the Council of Trent, Session XXI, Chap. 2, Pope Pius XII. Chapter 3 of the argument *Res Sacramenti* covers this matter fully.

200. If I have read you correctly, if, that is, you believe and are asserting that the validity of the form of Holy Eucharist depends on authentication by the Church, some novel consequences spring from that dependency.

201. One of these consequences is that if the Church can grant authentication, and thereby validity, it can refuse authentication, and thereby validity. Another consequence is that if the Church can grant authentication and thereby validity, it can withdraw an authentication already granted and thereby cause a formerly valid form to become an invalid form.

202. From that it follows that it would be possible for the Church, simply by withdrawing its authentication, to render invalid the immemorial form: *Hoc est enim corpus meum* and *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, novi et eterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*, which Pope Innocent III (just to pluck one authority out of the immense body of authority on this matter, in his *Cum Martha circa*, 29.11.1202, *vide Denz.* 414-415), states derives from Christ and the Apostles.

203. To aver that the Church could invalidate the immemorial form is tantamount to saying that the Church, at the moment it granted its 'authentication', instituted the sacrament of Holy Eucharist and gave it to Our Lord. That is an inversion of what the Church at large believes. The Church at large believes that Our Lord instituted the sacrament of Holy Eucharist and gave it to the Church. Further, in giving it to the Church, He caused it to be accompanied by certain instructions, for example: *Do this in my commemoration.* The 'this' which is to be done is what He demonstrated in their sight and in their hearing.

204. Having stated that the Eucharist is dependent upon the authentication by the Church you conclude your eighteenth paragraph affirming, in your fourth clause, that the Church 'prescribes its ritual in accordance with the revelation'. Revelation is to be found in Sacred Scripture and in Tradition. Whereabouts in either source may I find '*...for all so that sins may be forgiven*'?

205. Your nineteenth paragraph is replete with encomia for Arius. Certainly he must have had some appeal because, as Cardinal Newman affirms, 80% of the hierarchy of that time followed him into heresy.

206. That said, I believe your enthusiasm for him to be quite misplaced. Arius' difficulty was not only scriptural (he got the Scriptures calamitously wrong, was seemingly too proud to admit it, or too stupid to see it), it was also and primarily logical.

207. Arius inquired: 'If God the Son was begotten of the Father, does that not imply that the Father existed before Him?' He was unable to accommodate the concept that no father exists before the son he generates. Fatherhood and sonship begin, when they begin, contemporaneously. A father as father does not exist until there is a son. If fatherhood and sonship do not begin, that is, if they simply <u>are</u> from all eternity, again there is not one before the other. Certainly there is a priority of order but not of time whether we are dealing in time as with fathers and sons of this world, or dealing in eternity as with the Father and the Son of the Trinity.

208. Arius, the heresiarch, is still relevant in our day, because the world teems with neo-arians who deny the divinity of Our Lord, either explicitly or equivalently, i.e. impliedly, but in this correspondence he has no relevance. I introduced him into *Res Sacramenti* with no other view than to provide an example of a sacramental form - in this case, baptism - wrecked and rendered

than to provide an example of a sacramental form - in this case, baptism - wrecked and rendered invalid by changes that attained to the substance of that sacrament in the sacrilegious endeavour to make it conform to the aberrant views of the wrecker. Fred is a worthy successor, indeed exceeds by far the worldy success of Arius. Arius secured in his camp 80% of the hierarchy, Fred has outdone him, Fred has got them all, all at least of the Latin rite (which is about 90% of the Church world wide), without, so far as I know, one single exception.

Paul VI says *pro multis*. He says it in an Apostolic Constitution, than which no law is weightier. Fred says 'for all'. He says it by the most ingeniously contrived machinations detailed in Chapter Four of *Res Sacramenti*. Who should prevail? Paul VI. Who does prevail? Fred.

In Domino

P.S. Since concluding this letter I have had the advantage of a copy of *Liturgiam Authenticam* which has come into my hands. I wish now in this *post scriptum* to withdraw the tentatively hopeful note I struck in #177 and #178 above, and instead, now adopt the attitude of one who is content to wait and see, noting only that *Liturgiam Authenticam* depends for its implementation on the very people who have, these past thirty years, with pertinacity, defended error and brought close to extinction the Church in the West.